arXiv:1206.5550v1 [math.SP] 24 Jun 2012

# SPECTRAL THEORY OF A CANONICAL SYSTEM

KESHAV RAJ ACHARYA

Abstract. The aim of this paper is to show that, in the limit circle case, the deficiency index of a Symmetric relation induced by the Canonical System 1.1, is constant on $\mathbb{C}$. This provides a simple proof of the limit point case for the Canonical System 1.1 when trace$H \equiv 1$. To this end, we first discuss the deficiency index and spectral theory of any symmetric relation in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Then we analyze the spectrum of the relation induced by a Canonical System 1.1.

## 1. Introduction

This paper deals with the canonical system of the following form

$$Ju'(x) = zH(x)u(x). \tag{1.1}$$

Here $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $H(x)$ is a $2 \times 2$- matrix. The entries of $H$ are integrable functions on an interval $[0, N]$ and $H(x) \geq 0$ ( ie $H(x)$ is a positive semi-definite matrix). We also assume that there is no non-empty open interval $I \subset [0, N]$ so that $H \equiv 0$ *a.e.* on $I$. The complex number $z \in \mathbb{C}$ involved in 1.1 is a spectral parameter. For fixed $z \in \mathbb{C}$, a function $u(., z) : [0, N] \to \mathbb{C}^2$ is called a solution if $u$ is absolutely continuous and satisfies 1.1. We consider 1.1 in the Hilbert space $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$, the space of all (equivalance class) measurable almost everywhere finite vector function

$$f(x, z) = \begin{pmatrix} f_1(x) \\ f_2(x) \end{pmatrix} \text{ on } \mathbb{R}_+ \text{ such that } \int_0^\infty f(x)^* H(x) f(x) dx < \infty$$

provided with an inner product $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_0^\infty f(x)^* H(x) g(x) dx$. A function $f \in L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ is equivalent to the null element if and only if $Hf = 0$, *a.e.* on $\mathbb{R}_+$. In [2], Kac has constructed the space $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ and has given the proof of the completeness of this space.

We may think of writing the equation 1.1 in the form

$$H(x)^{-1} Ju' = zu$$

and consider as an eigenvalue problem of an operator on $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ . But $H(x)$ is not invertible in general that prevents us to work directly as an operator. However, 1.1 induces a relation as a graph sense. We introduce maximal, minimal and self-adjoint relations induced by 1.1. These relations have been studied by Hassi, De snoo, Winkler, and Remling in the papers [ [3],[5], [7], [9] ] in various context. Our primary goal in this paper is to prove : If the system 1.1 has all solutions in $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ for some $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, which we mean by the limit circle case, then the system has all solutions in $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. This question has been dealt in [8] for second order differential equation, in particular for Schrodinger equation. However, the similar techniques can not be applied for canonical system 1.1. This, in fact, leads us to develop the spectral theory of a relation on any Hilbert space. We establish some important theorems that characterizes the self-adjoint extension of a symmetric relation via defect indices. Then we do some spectral analysis of such self-adjoint relation. We use the spectral theory of a self-adjoint relation on any Hilbert space to analyze the spectral properties of the relations induced by 1.1 on the Hilbert space $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$.

**Organization of the paper:** In section 2, we introduce a relation on any Hilbert space. We define defect index for the relation and use it to see for a symmetric relation to have self adjoint extensions. Then we discuss the spectral theory of a self adjoint relation and see the relation between spectrum and spectral kernel. In order to do this we basically follow the book [4]. Since a relation has a multi valued part, the theorems from the operator theory do not follow quite obviously. Thus, we present the proof of the theorems for a relation in details.

In section 3 we consider the relation induced by 1.1 and use the theory from section 2 to discuss the spectral theory of a self adjoint relation induced by 1.1. We formulate the question as mentioned in the previous paragraph in terms of defect indices of the symmetric relation $\mathcal{R}_0$ induced by 1.1 as:

*In the limit circle case, the defect index* $\beta(\mathcal{R}_0, z)$ *of* $\mathcal{R}_0$ *is constant on* $\mathbb{C}$.

In order to prove our main theorem we basically follow the papers [ [3], [5], [7]] and use the spectral theory discussed in section 2. Finally, we see the application of our main theorem to prove that trace$H \equiv 1$ implies the limit point case of the system 1.1. This simplifies the proof of L. de Branges discussed in the paper [1].

## 2. SPECTRAL THEORY OF A SYMMETRIC RELATION IN A HILBERT SPACE.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space over the complex number $\mathbb{C}$ and denote by $\mathcal{H}^2$ the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$. A linear relation $\mathcal{R}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{H}^2$. Let $D(\mathcal{R}) = \{f \in \mathcal{H} : \ (f, g) \in \mathcal{R}\}$ and $R(\mathcal{R}) = \{g \in \mathcal{H} : \ (f, g) \in \mathcal{R}\}$ are respectively defined as the domain and range of the relation $\mathcal{R}$. Let $\mathcal{R}^{-1} = \{(g, f) : (f, g) \in \mathcal{R}\}$ denotes the inverse relation.
The adjoint of $\mathcal{R}$ in $\mathcal{H}^2$ is a closed linear relation defined by

$$\mathcal{R}^* = \{(h, k) \in \mathcal{H}^2 : \ \langle g, h\rangle = \langle f, k\rangle \text{ for all } (f, g) \in \mathcal{R}\}.$$

A linear relation $\mathcal{S}$ is called symmetric if $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{S}^*$ and self-adjoint if $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^*$. These relations have been studied in [10] and [11]. In order to see the self-adjoint extension of a symmetric relation we use the concept of deficiency indices. Our interest here is the spectrum of a self-adjoint extension of a symmetric relation. We prove most of the theorems from [4] for the case of symmetric relation in any Hilbert space. Let $\mathcal{R}_z = R(z - \mathcal{R}) = \{zf - g : \ (f, g) \in \mathcal{R}\}$ and $N(\mathcal{R}, z) = \{f : (f, zf) \in \mathcal{R}\}$.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For any relation $\mathcal{R}$, in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, $N(\mathcal{R}^*, \bar{z}) = \mathcal{R}_z^{\perp}$.*

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} u \in N(\mathcal{R}^*, \bar{z}) &\Leftrightarrow (u, \bar{z}u) \in \mathcal{R}^* \\ &\Leftrightarrow \text{ for any } (f, g) \in \mathcal{R}, \langle g, u\rangle = \langle f, \bar{z}u\rangle \\ &\Leftrightarrow \langle zf, u\rangle - \langle g, u\rangle = 0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \langle zf - g, u\rangle = 0. \Leftrightarrow u \in R_z^{\perp}. \end{aligned}$$

□

2.1. **Defect Indices and Self-adjoint extension.** Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a linear relation on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The set

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\mathcal{R}) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : &\text{ there exists a } C(z) > 0 \text{ such that} \\ &\|(zf - g)\| \geq C(z)\|f\| \text{ for all } (f, g) \in \mathcal{R}\} \end{aligned}$$

is called the regularity domain of $\mathcal{R}$.

**Theorem 2.2.** (1) *$z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{R})$ if and only if $(z - \mathcal{R})^{-1}$ is a bounded linear operator on $D(\mathcal{R})$.*
(2) *If $\mathcal{R}$ is symmetric, then $\mathbb{C} - \mathbb{R} \subset \Gamma(\mathcal{R})$.*
(3) *$\Gamma(\mathcal{R})$ is open.*

*Proof.* 1. If $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{R})$ the for any $(f, g) \in \mathcal{R}$, there is a constat $C(z) > 0$ such that

$$\|(zf - g)\| \geq C(z)\|f\|$$

this implies that $(z - \mathcal{R})^{-1}$ is a single valued relation. Clearly it is linear and bounded. Hence it is a bounded linear operator.Converse is obvious.
2. Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ is symmetric, then for any $z \in \mathbb{C} - \mathbb{R}, z = x + iy$ and $(f, g) \in \mathcal{R}$ we have

$$\|zf - g\|^2 = \|(xf - g)\|^2 + y^2\|f\|^2 \geq y^2\|f\|^2.$$

Hence $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{R})$.
3. Let $z_0 \in \Gamma(\mathcal{R})$. If $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z - z_0| \leq C(z_0)$, then

$$\|(zf - g)\| \geq \|z_0 f - g\| - |z - z_0|\|f\| \geq \big(C(z_0) - |z - z_0|\big)\|f\|.$$

□

The subspace $\mathcal{R}_z^\perp$ is called the defect space of $\mathcal{R}$ and $z$. The cardinal number $\beta(\mathcal{R}, z) = \dim \mathcal{R}_z^\perp$ is called the defect index of $\mathcal{R}$ and $z$.

**Theorem 2.3.** *The defect index $\beta(\mathcal{R}, z)$ is constant on each connected subset of $\Gamma(\mathcal{R})$. If $\mathcal{R}$ is symmetric, then the defect index is constant in the upper and lower half-planes.*

In order to prove this theorem we need to use the following results from operator theory.

**Proposition 2.4.** [4] *Let $P_1$ and $P_2$ are the projections acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, then we have*

$$\|P_1 - P_2\| = \ max\ \{\rho_{12}, \rho_{21}\}, \quad where\ \rho_{ij} = \sup\{\|P_j h\| :\ h \in R(P_k)^\perp, \|h\| \leq 1\}.$$

**Proposition 2.5.** [4] *If $P$ and $Q$ are orthogonal projection on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\|P - Q\| < 1$, then we have*

$$\dim R(P) = \dim R(Q), \quad \big(\dim R(I - P) = \dim R(I - Q)\big).$$

*Proof of the Theorem 2.3:* Let $Q_z$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_z$. Then we will first show that $\|Q_z - Q_{z_0}\| \to 0$ as $z \to z_0$, for any $z_0 \in \Gamma(\mathcal{R})$. For any $z_0 \in \Gamma(\mathcal{R})$, there is a constant $C(z_0) > 0$ such that

$$\|f\| \leq C(z_0)\|z_0 f - g\|,$$

for any $(f, g) \in \mathcal{R}$. For $|z - z_0| < \frac{1}{2C(z_0)}$ and all $(f, g) \in \mathcal{R}$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\| \leq C(z_0)\|z_0 f - g\| &\leq \Big(\|zf - g\| + |z - z_0|\|f\|\Big) \\ &\leq C(z_0)\|zf - g\| + \frac{1}{2}\|f\| \\ \therefore\ \ \|f\| &\leq C(z_0)\|zf - g\|. \end{aligned}$$

Now for $h \in R(Q_{z_0})^\perp = \mathcal{R}_{z_0}^\perp$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_z h\| &= \sup\{|\langle h, zf - g\rangle| :\ zf - g \in \mathcal{R}_z,\ \|zf - g\| \leq 1\} \\ &= \sup\{|\langle h, (z - z_0)f\rangle| :\ zf - g \in \mathcal{R}_z,\ \|zf - g\| \leq 1\}. \\ \therefore\ \ \|Q_z h\| &\leq \|h\||z - z_0|C(z_0). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for $h \in R(Q_z)^\perp = \mathcal{R}_z^\perp$

$$\|Q_{z_0} h\| \leq \|h\||z - z_0|C(z_0).$$

Now by Proposition 2.4

$$\|Q_z - Q_{z_0}\| \leq |z - z_0|C(z_0).$$

Let $P_z$ denotes an orthogonal projection onto $\bar{\mathcal{R}}_z^\perp$ then

$$\|p_z - p_{z_0}\| = \|Q_z - Q_{z_0}\| \leq |z - z_0|C(z_0) \to 0 \text{ as } z \to z_0.$$

Hence if we choose $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\|p_z - p_{z_0}\| < 1$, for $|z - z_0| < \epsilon$ then by Proposition 2.5, $\dim \mathcal{R}_z^\perp = \dim \mathcal{R}_{z_0}^\perp$. It follows that

$$\beta(\mathcal{R}, z) = \beta(\mathcal{R}, z_0) \text{ for } |z - z_0| < \epsilon.$$

If $\mathcal{R}$ is symmetric, then the upper and lower half-planes are connected subsets of $\Gamma(\mathcal{R})$; therefore, the defect index is constant there.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ is a symmetric relation on a Hilbert space, for $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ the defect index $m = \beta(\mathcal{R}, z)$ and for $w \in \mathbb{C}^-$ the defect index $n = \beta(\mathcal{R}, w)$ are written as a pair $(m, n)$ and is called the *defect indices* of $\mathcal{R}$.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a Symmetric relation on $\mathcal{H}$. The Cayley trnsform of $\mathcal{R}$ is defined by the relation

$$\mathcal{V} = \{(g + if, g - if) : \ (f, g) \in \mathcal{R}\}.$$

Then clearly $D(\mathcal{V}) = R(i + \mathcal{R})$ and $R(\mathcal{V}) = R(\mathcal{R} - i)$. $\mathcal{V}$ is called isometry if $\|f\| = \|g\|$ for all $(f, g) \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ is unitary if $D(\mathcal{V}) = R(\mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{H}$.

**Theorem 2.6.** *If $\mathcal{R}$ be a Symmetric relation on $\mathcal{H}$. and $\mathcal{V}$ is the Cayley transform of $\mathcal{R}$ then,*

1. *$\mathcal{V}$ is isometry*
2. *$R(I - \mathcal{V}) = D(\mathcal{R})$. The relation $\mathcal{R}$ is given by $\mathcal{R} = \{(f - g, i(f + g)) : (f, g) \in \mathcal{V}\}$.*
3. *$\mathcal{R}$ is multi-valued if and only if $N(I - \mathcal{V}) \neq \{0\}$*

*Proof.* 1. Let $(u, v) \in \mathcal{V}$ then $u = g + if$ and $v = g - if$ for some $(f, g) \in \mathcal{R}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g - if\|^2 &= \langle g - if, g - if\rangle \\
&= \langle g, g\rangle - i\langle f, g\rangle + i\langle f, g\rangle + \langle if, if\rangle \\
&= \langle g, g\rangle + \langle if, g\rangle + \langle g, if\rangle + \langle if, if\rangle = \langle g + if, g + if\rangle \\
&= \|g + if\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

2. This is clear.
3. Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ is multi-valued then there is some $g \in \mathcal{H}, g \neq 0$ such that $(0, g) \in \mathcal{R}$.. It follows by definition of $\mathcal{V}, (g, g) \in \mathcal{V}$. Hence $g \in N(I - \mathcal{V})$. On the other hand , let $g \in N(I - \mathcal{V}), g \neq 0$ then $(g, g) \in \mathcal{V}$. then by 2, $(0, 2ig) \in \mathcal{R}$. Hence $\mathcal{R}$ is multi-valued . □

**Theorem 2.7.** *A relation $\mathcal{V}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is the Cayley transform of a symmetric relation $\mathcal{R}$ if and only if $\mathcal{V}$ has the following properties.*

1. *$\mathcal{V}$ is an isometric relation.*
2. *$R(I - \mathcal{V}) = D(\mathcal{R})$.*

*The relation $\mathcal{R}$ is given by $\mathcal{R} = \{(f - g, i(f + g)) : \ (f, g) \in \mathcal{V}\}$.*

*Proof.* If a relation $\mathcal{V}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is the Cayley transform of a symmetric relation $\mathcal{R}$, then by Theorem 3.1, $\mathcal{V}$ satisfies the properties 1 and 2. Conversely suppose $\mathcal{V}$ has properties 1 and 2, we show that the relation $\mathcal{R}$ is given by $\mathcal{R} = \{(f - g, i(f + g)) : \ (f, g) \in \mathcal{V}\}$ is symmetric relation.
Suppose $(f_1 - g_1, i(f_1 + g_1), \ ((f_2 - g_2, i(f_2 + g_2)) \in \mathcal{R}$ then

$$\langle i(f_1 + g_1), (f_2 - g_2)\rangle = -i\Big(\langle f_1, f_2\rangle - \langle f_1, g_2\rangle + \langle g_1, f_2\rangle - \langle g_1, g_2\rangle\Big).$$

Since $\mathcal{V}$ is an isometry, for any $(f_1, g_1), (f_2, g_2) \in \mathcal{V}$, $\langle f_1, f_2\rangle = \langle g_1, g_2\rangle$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle i(f_1+g_1), (f_2-g_2)\rangle &= -i\langle g_1, g_2\rangle + i\langle f_1, g_2\rangle - i\langle g_1, f_2\rangle + i\langle f_1, f_2\rangle\\ &= -i\Big(\langle g_1 - f_1, g_2\rangle + \langle g_1 - f_1, f_2\rangle\Big)\\ &= \langle f_1 - g_1, i(f_2+g_2)\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\mathcal{R}$ is symmetric. □

**Theorem 2.8.** *$\mathcal{R}$ is self adjoint if and only if $\mathcal{V}$ is unitary.*

*Proof.* We will show that the $\mathcal{R}$ is self adjoint if and only if

$$R(\mathcal{R}+i) = R(\mathcal{R}-i) = \mathcal{H}.$$

Since $\mathcal{R}$ is symmetry we always have $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{R}^*$. Let $(f, g) \in \mathcal{R}^*$ then $if - g \in \mathcal{H}$ and $R(\mathcal{R}-i) = \mathcal{H}$ implies that there is $(h, k) \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $k - ih = if - g$. So $i(f+h) = k+g$. So that $(f+h, i(f+h)) \in \mathcal{R}^*$. That is

$$(f+h) \in N(\mathcal{R}^*, i) = R((\mathcal{R}+i)^\perp) = \{0\}.$$

This implies $f = -h \in D(\mathcal{R})$. Hence $\mathcal{R}$ is self adjoint.

Conversely suppose $\mathcal{R}$ is self-adjoint. Let

$$h \in R(\mathcal{R}-i)^\perp = N(\mathcal{R}^*, -i) = N(\mathcal{R}, -i).$$

So $(h, -ih) \in \mathcal{R}$. But

$$\langle -ih, h\rangle = \langle h, ih\rangle \Rightarrow i\langle h, h\rangle = -i\langle h, h\rangle.$$

Hence we must have $h = 0$. So $R(\mathcal{R}-i) = \mathcal{H}$. Similarly, $R(\mathcal{R}+i) = \mathcal{H}$. □

**Theorem 2.9.** *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a closed symmetric relation on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ denotes its Cayley transform.*

1. *$\mathcal{V}'$ is the Cayley transform of a closed symmetric extension $\mathcal{R}'$ of $\mathcal{R}$ if and only if the following holds: There exists closed subspaces $F_-$ of $R(\mathcal{R}-i)^\perp$ and $F_+$ of $R(\mathcal{R}+i)^\perp$ and an isometric relation $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ on $F_+ \oplus F_-$ for which*

$$\mathcal{V}' = \{(f+h, g+k) : (f,g) \in \mathcal{V}, (h,k) \in \tilde{\mathcal{V}}\} \text{ and}$$

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{V}') &= R(\mathcal{R}'+i) = R(\mathcal{R}+i) \oplus F_+,\\ R(\mathcal{V}') &= R(\mathcal{R}'-i) = R(\mathcal{R}-i) \oplus F_-.\end{aligned}$$

   *The spaces $F_+$ and $F_-$ have the same dimension.*
2. *The relation $\mathcal{V}'$ in part 1 is unitary if and only if $F_- = R(\mathcal{R}-i)^\perp$ and $F_+ = R(\mathcal{R}+i)^\perp$.*
3. *$\mathcal{R}$ possess self-adjoint extension if and only if its defect indices are equal.*

*Proof.* 1. Suppose $\mathcal{V}'$ has the given form. Then $\mathcal{V}'$ is isometric relation, since for any $(f+h, g+k) \in \mathcal{V}'$ we have,

$$\|g+k\|^2 = \|g\|^2 + \|k\|^2 = \|f\|^2 + \|h\|^2 = \|f+h\|^2.$$

Hence we can defined a Symmetric extension $\mathcal{R}'$ such that $\mathcal{V}'$ is its Cayleys transform. Conversely if $\mathcal{V}'$ is the Cayley transform of a symmetric extension $\mathcal{R}'$ of $\mathcal{R}$, then put $F_- = R(\mathcal{R}'-i) \ominus R(\mathcal{R}-i)$, $F_+ = R(\mathcal{R}'+i) \ominus R(\mathcal{R}+i)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{V}'|_{F_+ \oplus F_-}$.

Then we have the desired properties.
2. Here we have $\mathcal{V}'$ is unitary if and only if

$$D(\mathcal{V}') = R(\mathcal{V}') = \mathcal{H}.$$

That is, if and only if $F_- = R(\mathcal{R} - i)^\perp$ and $F_+ = R(\mathcal{R} + i)^\perp$.
3. By 1 and 2, $\mathcal{V}$ posses unitary extension if and only if there exists an isometry relation $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ onto $R(\mathcal{R} + i)^\perp \oplus R(\mathcal{R} - i)^\perp$. This happens if and only if

$$\dim(R(\mathcal{R} + i)^\perp) = \dim(R(\mathcal{R} - i)^\perp).$$

□

By definition of Cayley transform, it is clear that if $\mathcal{V}_1$ and $\mathcal{V}_2$ are the Cayley transforms of any two Symmetric relations $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ then $\mathcal{R}_1 \subset \mathcal{R}_2$ iff $\mathcal{V}_1 \subset \mathcal{V}_2$. We say that $\mathcal{R}_2$ is $m$-dimensional extension of $\mathcal{R}_1$ if $\mathcal{R}_1 \subset \mathcal{R}_2$ and $\dim D(\mathcal{R}_2)/D(\mathcal{R}_1) = m$.

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a closed symmetric relation on a Hilbert space with deficiency indices $(m, m)$.*

(1) *$\mathcal{R}'$ be a symmetric extension of $\mathcal{R}$ if and only if the following holds: There are closed subspaces $F_+$ of $R(i+\mathcal{R})^\perp$ and $F_-$ of $R(i-\mathcal{R})^\perp$ and an isometric mapping $\hat{\mathcal{V}}$ of $F_+$ onto $F_-$ such that*

$$D(\mathcal{R}') = D(\mathcal{R}) + \{g + \hat{\mathcal{V}}g : g \in F_+\}.$$

(2) *$\mathcal{R}'$ is self-adjoint if and only if $\mathcal{R}'$ is an $m-$dimensional extension of $\mathcal{R}$*

.

*Proof.* (1). Let $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{V}'$ be the Cayley transform of the closed symmetric relation $\mathcal{R}$ and its symmetric extension $\mathcal{R}$, respectively. By Theorem 2.9 there exists closed subspaces $F_-$ of $R(\mathcal{R} - i)^\perp$ and $F_+$ of $R(\mathcal{R} + i)^\perp$ and an isometric relation $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$ on $F_+ \oplus F_-$ for which

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}' &= \{(f + h, g + k) : (f, g) \in \mathcal{V}, (h, k) \in \tilde{\mathcal{V}}\} \text{ and} \\ D(\mathcal{V}') &= R(\mathcal{R}' + i) = R(\mathcal{R} + i) \oplus F_+, \\ R(\mathcal{V}') &= R(\mathcal{R}' - i) = R(\mathcal{R} - i) \oplus F_-. \end{aligned}$$

Then by definition of the Cayley transform we see that,

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathcal{R}') &= R(I - \mathcal{V}') = (I - \mathcal{V}')D(\mathcal{V}') \\ &= (I - \mathcal{V}')R(i + \mathcal{R}') \\ &= (I - \mathcal{V}')(R(i + \mathcal{R}) \oplus F_+) \\ &= (I - \mathcal{V}')(D(\mathcal{V}) \oplus F_+) \\ &= (I - \mathcal{V})D(\mathcal{V}) + (I - \mathcal{V}')F_+ \\ &= D(\mathcal{R}) + \{g - \tilde{\mathcal{V}}g : g \in F_+\}. \end{aligned}$$

The converse is similar.
(2). By Theorem 2.9 $\mathcal{R}'$ is self-adjoint if and only if $\mathcal{V}'$ is unitary. This happens if and only if $F_+ = R(\mathcal{R} + i)^\perp$. So by 1, $\mathcal{R}'$ is self-adjoint if and only if it is an $m-$dimensional extension of $\mathcal{R}$. □

**Theorem 2.11.** *Suppose $\mathcal{T}$ is a self adjoint relation and suppose $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$ then*

$$\mathcal{H} = \{zf - g : \quad (f, g) \in \mathcal{T}\}.$$

*Proof.* We will show that $R(z-\mathcal{T}) = \{zf - g : \ (f,g) \in \mathcal{T}\}$ is a close subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Since $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$ there is a constant $C(z)$ such that

$$\|zf - g\| \geq C(z)\|f\|.$$

Let $v_n \in R(z-\mathcal{T})$ and $v_n \to v$ in $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose $f_n \in D(\mathcal{T})$ such that $(f_n, g_n) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $v_n = zf_n - g_n$ so that $(f_n, v_n) \in z - \mathcal{T}$. But from above relation we have

$$\|v_n - v_m\| = \|z(f_n - f_m) - (g_n - g_m)\| \geq C\|f_n - f_m\|.$$

It follows that $f_n$ is a Cauchy sequence in $\mathcal{H}$, hence it converges to some $f$ in $\mathcal{H}$. Hence $(f_n, v_n) \to (f, v)$. Since $\mathcal{T}$ is closed , $f \in D(\mathcal{T})$ and $(f, v) \in z - \mathcal{T}$ and $v \in R(z-\mathcal{T})$. Hence $R(z-\mathcal{T})$ is closed. So we have

$$\mathcal{H} = R(z-\mathcal{T}) \oplus R(z-\mathcal{T})^{\perp}.$$

We next show that $R(z-\mathcal{T})^{\perp} = \{0\}$. Let $h \in R(z-\mathcal{T})^{\perp} = N(\mathcal{T}, z)$ then $(h, zh) \in \mathcal{T}$. But since $0 = \|zh - zh\| \geq C(z)\|h\|$, $h = 0$ a. e. This completes the proof. □

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a self-adjoint relation on $\mathcal{H}$. Define $T : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ by $T(zf - g) = f$. That is $T = (z-\mathcal{T})^{-1} = \{(zf - g, f) : \ (f,g) \in \mathcal{T}\}$. Then $T$ is a bounded linear operator since

$$\|T\| = \sup_{\|zf-g\|=1} \|T(zf - g)\| = \sup_{\|zf-g\|=1} \|f\| \leq \frac{1}{C(z)}$$

and $\mathcal{T}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{T} = \{(Tf, zTf - f) : \ f \in \mathcal{H}\}.$$

**Definition 2.12.** *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a closed relation on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. We define*

$$\rho(\mathcal{R}) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \exists\, T \in B(\mathcal{H}) : \mathcal{R} = \{(Tf, zTf - f) : \ f \in \mathcal{H}\}\}$$

*to be the resolvent set of the relation $\mathcal{R}$ and*

$$\sigma(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbb{C} - \rho(\mathcal{R})$$

*to be the spectrum of $\mathcal{R}$.*

**Remark 2.13.** *When a relation $\mathcal{R}$ is an operator on $\mathcal{H}$ then*

$$\rho(\mathcal{R}) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ (z-\mathcal{R})^{-1} \in B(\mathcal{H})\}$$

*Proof.* Suppose a relation $\mathcal{R}$ is an operator. If $z \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $(z-\mathcal{R})^{-1} \in B(\mathcal{H})$ then take $T = (z-\mathcal{R})^{-1}$ so that for any $(f,g) \in \mathcal{R}$, $zf - g \in \mathcal{H}$ and

$$(f,g) = (T(zf-g), zT(zf-g) - (zf-g)).$$

Also for any $f \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&(z-\mathcal{R})(z-\mathcal{R})^{-1}f = f \\
&\Rightarrow (z-\mathcal{R})Tf = f \\
&\Rightarrow \mathcal{R}Tf = zTf - f \\
&\Rightarrow (Tf, zTf - f) \in \mathcal{R}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \ (z-\mathcal{R})^{-1} \in B(\mathcal{H})\} \subset \rho(\mathcal{R})$. On the other hand , let $z \in \rho(\mathcal{R})$ want to show that $(z-\mathcal{R})$ is bijective. Let $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $Tf_1 \neq Tf_2$ suppose

$$(z-\mathcal{R})Tf_1 = (z-\mathcal{R})Tf_2 \ \Rightarrow f_1 = f_2.$$

This is not possible because $T$ is an operator and $Tf_1 \neq Tf_2$ . So $(z-\mathcal{R})$ is one to one. Also for any $f \in \mathcal{H},\ Tf \in \mathcal{H}$ and $(z-R)Tf = zTf - zTf + f = f$. This implies that $(z-\mathcal{R})$ is onto. Now for any

$$f \in \mathcal{H},\ \|(z-\mathcal{R})^{-1}f\| \leq \|Tf\| \leq C\|f\|.$$

Hence $(z-\mathcal{R})^{-1} \in B(\mathcal{H})$. □

A complex number $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is called an eigenvalue of a relation $\mathcal{R}$ if there exists a $f \in \mathcal{H},\ f \neq 0$ such that $(f, zf) \in \mathcal{R}$. The set of all eigenvalues of $\mathcal{R}$ is called the point spectrum of $\mathcal{R}$ and is denoted by $\sigma_p(\mathcal{R})$.

**Lemma 2.14.** *For any relation $\mathcal{R}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, $\sigma_p(\mathcal{R}) \subset \sigma(\mathcal{R})$.*

*Proof.* Let $z \in \sigma_p(\mathcal{R})$. Then there exists $f \in \mathcal{H},\ f \neq 0$ such that $(f, zf) \in \mathcal{R}$. Suppose $z \notin \sigma(\mathcal{R})$ then $z \in \rho(\mathcal{R})$ so there exists $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mathcal{R} = \{(Tf, zTf - f) :\ f \in \mathcal{H}\}$. Since $(f, zf) \in \mathcal{R}$ there is some $u \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $f = Tu$ and $zf = zTu - u$. This implies that $u = 0$ and hence $f = Tu = 0$. This contradicts the fact that $f \neq 0$. So $z \in \sigma(\mathcal{R})$. It follows that $\sigma_p(\mathcal{R}) \subset \sigma(\mathcal{R})$.

□

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \{(0, g) \in \mathcal{R}\}$ and $Z = \{g :\ (0, g) \in \mathcal{R}\}$ be the multi-valued part of a relation $\mathcal{R}$. Clearly $Z$ is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{H}$. Note that $D(\mathcal{R})$ is not dense if $\mathcal{R}$ is multi-valued. Now define the quotient space $\mathcal{H}_s = \mathcal{H}/Z$. We know that this quotient space is also a Hilbert space with the norm defined by

$$\|[f]\| = \inf_{g \in Z} \|f + g\|.$$

Define a relation $\mathcal{R}_s$ on $\mathcal{H}_s \oplus \mathcal{H}_s$ by $\mathcal{R}_s = \{([f], [g]) : (f, g) \in \mathcal{R}\}$. We consider the relation $\mathcal{R}_s$ as the restriction of $\mathcal{R}$ on $\mathcal{H}_s$. By natural isomorphism, the space $\mathcal{H}_s$ is identified as $\mathcal{H} \ominus Z$ and the relation $\mathcal{R}_s$ as $\mathcal{R} \ominus \mathcal{Z}$. Then clearly $\mathcal{R}_s$ is an operator on $\mathcal{H}_s$ with $D(\mathcal{R}_s) = D(\mathcal{R})$.

We call $S(\mathcal{R}) = \mathbb{C} - \Gamma(\mathcal{R})$ the spectral kernel of $\mathcal{R}$. We have the following important relation about the spectrum.

**Theorem 2.15.** *If $\mathcal{T}$ is a self-adjoint relation on $\mathcal{H}$ then*

$$S(\mathcal{T}) = \sigma(\mathcal{T}) = \sigma(\mathcal{T}_s)$$

.

*Proof.* Let $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$ then there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\|zf - g\| \geq C\|f\| \text{ for all } (f, g) \in \mathcal{T}.$$

For such $z$, we can define $T = \{(zf - g, f) :\ (f, g) \in \mathcal{T}\}$ a bounded linear operator on $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{T} = \{(Th, zTh - h) :\ h \in \mathcal{H}\}$. So $z \in \rho(\mathcal{T})$. On the other hand, let $z \in \rho(\mathcal{T})$ then there exists some $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\mathcal{T} = \{(Th, zTh - h) :\ h \in \mathcal{H}\}$. For any $(f, g) \in \mathcal{T}$, there exists $h \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $Th = f$ and $zTh - h = g$. So

$$\|zf - g\| = \|zTh - zTh + h\| = \|h\| \geq C\|Th\| = C\|f\|$$

for some $C > 0$ and hence $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$. Hence, $S(\mathcal{T}) = \sigma(\mathcal{T})$.

Next assume that $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}_s)$ then for any $([f], [g]) \in \mathcal{T}_s$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|z[f] - [g]\| \geq C\|[f]\|.$$

For any $(f,g) \in \mathcal{T}$ we have

$$\|zf - g\| \geq \|z[f] - [g]\| \geq C\|[f]\| = C\|f\|.$$

Hence $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$. On the other hand suppose $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$ then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|zf - g\| \geq C\|f\|.$$

For any $([f],[g]) \in \mathcal{T}_s$ we have

$$\|z[f]-[g]\| = \inf_{u \in Z} \|zf-g+u\| = \inf_{u \in Z} \Big(\|zf-g\|+\|u\|\Big) \geq \|zf-g\| \geq C\|f\| = C\|[f]\|.$$

This implies that $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}_s)$. Thus $S(\mathcal{T}_s) = S(\mathcal{T})$. Hence $S(\mathcal{T}) = \sigma(\mathcal{T}) = \sigma(\mathcal{T}_s)$. $\square$

**Remark 2.16.** *If $\mathcal{T}$ is a self-adjoint relation on $\mathcal{H}$ then $\sigma(\mathcal{T}) \subset \mathbb{R}$.*

**Theorem 2.17.** *Let $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$ and $T = (\mathcal{T} - z)^{-1}$.*

1. *If $\lambda \in \Gamma(T)$ then $(z - \frac{1}{\lambda}) \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$.*
2. *If $\lambda \in S(\mathcal{T})$ then $\frac{1}{z-\lambda} \in S(T)$.*
3. *$S(T) \subset \sigma(T)$.*

*Proof.* (1). Let $\lambda \in \Gamma(T)$ then by definition there exists $C(\lambda) > 0$ such that

$$\|\lambda(zf - g) - f\| \geq C(\lambda)\|zf - g\| \text{ for any } (f,g) \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Note that $\lambda \neq 0$. For any $(f,g) \in \mathcal{T}$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(z - \frac{1}{\lambda})f - g\| &= \frac{1}{|\lambda|}\|z\lambda f - f - \lambda g\| \\ &= \frac{1}{|\lambda|}\|\lambda(zf - g) - f\| \\ &\geq \frac{C(\lambda)}{|\lambda|}\|zf - g\| \geq \frac{C(\lambda)C(z)}{|\lambda|}\|f\|. \end{aligned}$$

So $(z - \frac{1}{\lambda}) \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$.
(2). Let $\lambda \in S(\mathcal{T})$ and suppose $\frac{1}{z-\lambda} \notin S(T)$. Then $\frac{1}{z-\lambda} \in \Gamma(T)$. But by (1), $(z - \frac{1}{\frac{1}{z-\lambda}}) \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$. This implies that $\lambda \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T})$ which is a contradiction.
(3). Let $\lambda \in \rho(T)$ then $(\lambda - T)^{-1}$ is bounded and is defined on all of $\mathcal{H}$ then for any $(f,g) \in \mathcal{T}$

$$\|zf - g\| = \|(\lambda - T)^{-1}(\lambda - T)(zf - g)\| \leq \|(\lambda - T)^{-1}\|\|\lambda(zf - g) - T(zf - g)\|$$

$$\Rightarrow \|\lambda(zf - g) - T(zf - g)\| \geq \frac{1}{\|(\lambda - T)^{-1}\|}\|zf - g\|.$$

$\Rightarrow \lambda \in \Gamma(T)$. This shows that $S(T) \subset \sigma(T)$. $\square$

## 3. Relation induced by a Canonical System on $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$

We consider a relation $\mathcal{R}$ in the Hilbert space $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ induced by 1.1 as

$$\mathcal{R} = \{(f,g) \in \left(L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)\right)^2 : \ f \in AC, Jf' = Hg\}$$

and is called the maximal relation. This relation is made up of pairs of equivalence classes $(f,g)$, such that there exists a locally absolutely continuous representative of $f$ again denoted by $f$, and a representative of $g$, again denoted by $g$, such that $Jf' = Hg$ *a.e.* on $\mathbb{R}_+$. The adjoint relation $\mathcal{R}_0 = R^*$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = \{(f,g) \in \left(L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)\right)^2 : \langle g,h \rangle = \langle f,k \rangle \ \text{ for all } (h,k) \in \mathcal{R}\}$$

and is called the minimal relation. We want to show that $\mathcal{R}$ is closed and $\mathcal{R}_0$ is symmetric. Introduce a relation $\mathcal{R}_c$ in $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ by

$$\mathcal{R}_c = \{(f, g) \in \mathcal{R} : f \text{ has a compact support}\}.$$

We think that some of the lemmas and theorems from [3] are worth discussing here.

**Lemma 3.1.** [3] *Let* $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ *be a compact interval. If* $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{R}_c$ *and* $\operatorname{supp} \phi \subset [a, b]$, *then* $\psi$ *satisfies:*

$$\operatorname{supp} H\psi \subset [a, b], \quad \int_a^b H(t)\psi(t)dt = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

*Conversely, if the function* $\psi \in L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ *satisfies relation 3.1, then there exists* $\phi$, *such that* $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{R}_c$ *and* $\operatorname{supp} \phi \subset [a, b]$.

*Proof.* If $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{R}_c$, then $\phi, \psi \in L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ and $\phi' = -JH\psi$. Hence $\operatorname{supp} H\psi \subset [a, b]$. Since $\phi(a) = 0, \phi(x) = -\int_a^x JH(t)\psi(t)dt$. Moreover, $\phi(b) = 0$ implies $-\int_a^b JH(t)\psi(t)dt = 0 \Rightarrow \int_a^b H(t)\psi(t)dt = 0$. To see the converse, let $\psi \in L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ satisfying the 3.1 and define,

$$\phi(x) = -\int_a^x JH(t)\psi(t)dt.$$

Then $\operatorname{supp} \phi \subset [a, b]$ and $J\phi' = H\psi$. Hence $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{R}_c$ and $\operatorname{supp} \phi \subset [a, b]$. □

**Lemma 3.2.** [3] *The linear relation* $\mathcal{R}_c$ *is symmetric and* $\mathcal{R}_c \subset \mathcal{R}_c^* = \mathcal{R}$.

*Proof.* Let $(f, g) \in \mathcal{R}$ and $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{R}_c$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle g, \phi \rangle - \langle f, \psi \rangle &= \int_a^b g^* H\phi dt - \int_a^b f^* H\psi dt \\
&= \int_a^b (Jf')^* \phi dt - \int_a^b f^* J\phi' dt \\
&= -\int_a^b f'^* J\phi dt - \int_a^b f^* J\phi' dt \\
&= -f^* J\phi|_a^b + \int_a^b f^* J\phi' dt - \int_a^b f^* J\phi' dt \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $(f, g) \in \mathcal{R}_c^*$ and $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{R}_c^*$. To show the reverse, let $(h, k) \in \mathcal{R}_c^*$ then $h, k \in L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$. Let $u$ be a solution of the equation $Ju' = Hk$. Suppose $[a, b]$ be a compact interval. For $\psi \in L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ satisfying 3.1, and $\phi$ as in Lemma 3.1 so that

$(\phi,\psi)\in\mathcal{R}_c$, then $\langle h,\psi\rangle-\langle k,\phi\rangle=0$. That is

$$\begin{aligned}\int_a^b h(t)^*H(t)\psi(t)dt &= \int_a^b k(t)^*H(t)\phi(t)dt\\ &= -\int_a^b u'(t)^*J\phi(t)dt\\ &= \int_a^b u(t)^*J\phi' dt\\ &= \int_a^b u(t)^*H(t)\psi dt\end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow \int_a^b \big(h(t)-u(t)\big)^*H(t)\psi(t)dt=0$$

By Lemma 3.1, the function $\psi(t)$ span the orthogonal complement of constants on $[a,b]$. Hence $h(t)-u(t)$ is equivalent to a constant on $[a,b]$. Therefore, $h$ has a representative again denoted by $h$, which is absolutely continuous and satisfies $Jh'=Ju'=Hk$ a.e. on $[a,b]$. Suppose $I\subset[a,b]$ is a compact subinterval of positive type then the absolutely continuous representative does not depend on $I\subset[a,b]$. Since $[a,b]$ was arbitrary, it follows that $(h,k)\in\mathcal{R}$. Hence $\mathcal{R}_c^*=\mathcal{R}$, so that $\mathcal{R}_c$ is symmetric. ☐

**Corollary 3.3.** [3] *The linear relation $\mathcal{R}$ is closed and $\mathcal{R}_0$ is closed and symmetric.*

*Proof.* Since $\mathcal{R}=\mathcal{R}_c^*$ and $\mathcal{R}_0=\mathcal{R}^*$, $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}_0$ are closed. To show $\mathcal{R}_0$ is symmetric, let $(h,k)\in\mathcal{R}_0$, then by definition, $\langle f,k\rangle-\langle g,h\rangle=0$ for all $(f,g)\in\mathcal{R}$. So for $(\phi,\psi)\in\mathcal{R}_c\subset\mathcal{R}$ we see that $\langle\phi,k\rangle-\langle\psi,h\rangle=0$ for all $(\phi,\psi)\in\mathcal{R}_c$. This implies that $(h,k)\in\mathcal{R}_c^*=\mathcal{R}$. So $\mathcal{R}_0\subset\mathcal{R}_0^*=\mathcal{R}$. ☐

**Lemma 3.4.** [3] *For each $c,d\in\mathbb{C}^2$ there exists $(\phi_0,\psi_0),(\phi_N,\psi_N)\in\mathcal{R}$ such that $\phi_0,\phi_N$ have compact support and $\phi(0+)=c,\phi(N-)=d$.*

*Proof.* Choose $[0,N]$ so that it contains an open subinterval of positive type. Then the matrix $\int_0^N H(t)dt$ is invertible. Hence there exists vectors $u,v\in\mathbb{C}^2$ such that

$$\Big(\int_0^N H(t)dt\Big)u=-Jc,\qquad \Big(\int_0^N H(t)dt\Big)v=Jd.$$

Define $\psi_0\in L^2(H,\mathbb{R}_+)$ by

$$\psi_0(t)=u,\ 0\le t\le N,\ \psi_0(t)=0,\ \ t>N,$$

and define $\phi_0$ by

$$\phi_0(x)=c-\int_0^x JH(t)\psi_0(x)dt.$$

Then $\phi_0$ is in $L^2(H,\mathbb{R}_+)$, and is absolutely continuous and $\operatorname{supp}\phi_0\subset[0,N]$. Moreover, $\phi_0(0+)=c$ and $J\phi_0'=H\psi_0$ so that $(\phi_0,\psi_0)\in\mathcal{R}$. Similarly, define $\psi_N\in L^2(H,\mathbb{R}_+)$ by

$$\psi_N(t)=v,\ 0\le t\le N,\ \psi_N(t)=0,\ \ t>N,$$

and define $\phi_N$ by

$$\phi_N(x)=d-\int_N^x JH(t)\psi_N(x)dt.$$

For $x < N$ the integral is read as $\int_N^x JH(t)\psi_N(x)dt = -\int_x^N JH(t)\psi_N(x)dt$. Then $\phi_N$ is in $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$, and is absolutely continuous and $\operatorname{supp}\phi_N \subset [0, N]$. Moreover, $\phi_N(N-) = d$ and $J\phi_N' = H\psi_N$ $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** [3] *Let* $(f, g), (h, k) \in \mathcal{R}$. *Then the following limit exists:*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} h(x)Jf(x) = h(0+)Jf(0+) - [\langle f, k\rangle - \langle g, h\rangle]. \tag{3.2}$$

*Proof.* Let $(f, g), (h, k) \in \mathcal{R}$. Using integration by parts we get,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^x h(t)^*H(t)g(t)dt - \int_0^x k(t)^*H(t)f(t)dt &= \int_0^x h(t)^*Jf'(t)dt + \int_0^x h'(t)^*Jf(t)dt \\ &= \int_0^x \frac{d}{dt}h(t)^*Jf(t)dt \\ &= h(x)^*Jf(x) - h(0+)^*Jf(0+).\end{aligned}$$

As $x \to \infty$ the left side converges to $\langle h, g\rangle - \langle f, k\rangle$. Hence the limit $\lim_{x\to\infty} h(x)^*Jf(x)$ exists. $\square$

.

**Lemma 3.6.** *The minimal relation* $\mathcal{R}_0$ *is given by*

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = \{(f, g) \in \mathcal{R} : f(0+) = 0,\ \lim_{x\to\infty} f^*(x)Jh(x) = 0 \text{ for all } (h, k) \in \mathcal{R}\}.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.5 we get

$$\{(f, g) \in \mathcal{R} : f(0+) = 0,\ \lim_{x\to\infty} f^*(x)Jh(x) = 0 \text{ for all } (h, k) \in \mathcal{R}\} \subset \mathcal{R}_0.$$

On the other hand let $(f, g) \in R_0$. By Lemma 3.4 for any $u \in \mathbb{C}^2$ there exists $(\phi, \psi) \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $\phi$ has compact support and $\phi(0+) = c$. So

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \langle f, \psi\rangle - \langle g, \phi\rangle \\ &= \lim_{x\to\infty} f^*(x)J\phi(x) - \phi(0+)Jf(0+) \\ &= uJf(0+).\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $f(0+) = 0$. This would also forces that

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} f^*(x)Jh(x) = 0 \text{ for all } (h, k) \in \mathcal{R}.$$

$\square$

**Remark 3.7.** *The dimension of the solution space of the system 1.1 is two.*

**Lemma 3.8.** *The defect index* $\beta(\mathcal{R}_0)$ *of the minimal relation* $\mathcal{R}_0$ *is equal to the number of linearly independent solutions of the system 1.1 of whose class lie in* $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ .

*Proof.* First we show that any two different solutions of the system 1.1 for some fixed $z \in \mathbb{C}$ belongs to the different class of functions. Let $u$ and $v$ be any two different solutions of the system 1.1, ie $Ju' = zHu$ and $Jv' = zHv$. Then $J(u' - v') = zH(u - v)$. Suppose $u$ and $v$ lie on the same class so that

$$H(u - v) = 0,\ \Rightarrow J(u' - v') = 0,\ \Rightarrow u - v = C,$$

some constat $C$. But $H(u - v) = HC = 0 \Rightarrow C = 0$. It follows that $u \equiv v$. Next we show that, any two solutions $u, v$ are linearly independent if and only if their corresponding class $[u], [v]$ are linearly independent. Suppose $[u], [v]$ are linearly independent and let $u, v$ be any representative of $[u], [v]$ respectively such that $au + bv = 0$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $0 = [au + bv] = a[u] + b[v] \Rightarrow a = 0, b = 0$. So $u$ and $v$ are linearly independent. Conversely suppose $u$ and $v$ are linearly independent. If $[u] = a[v]$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ then $u = ah$ for some $h \in [v]$. This shows that $h$ is also a solution of the system 1.1 that lie in $[v]$ but this implies that $h \equiv v$. Hence $u = av$ which is a contradiction. This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Since $\mathcal{R}_0$ has (equal) defect indices, by Theorem 2.9 it has a self-adjoint extension say $\mathcal{T}$. We would like to have clear description of this self-adjoint relation. For this, first consider the canonical system 1.1 on a large compact interval $[0, N]$.

**Remark 3.9.** *In limit circle case, the defect indices of the minimal relation* $\mathcal{R}_0$ *are* $(2, 2)$.

Consider a relation ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} = \{(f, g) \in \mathcal{R} : & f_1(0)\sin\alpha + f_2(0)\cos\alpha = 0, \\ & f_1(N)\sin\beta + f_2(N)\cos\beta = 0, \quad \alpha, \beta \in (0, \pi]\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.10.** $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ *is a self-adjoint relation.*

*Proof.* Clearly $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is a symmetric relation because of the boundary conditions at 0 and $N$. We will show that $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is an 2-dimensional extension of $\mathcal{R}_0$. Then by Theorem 2.10, $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is an self-adjoint relation. By Lemma 3.4, for $c = \begin{pmatrix} -\cos\alpha \\ \sin\alpha \end{pmatrix}$ and $w = \begin{pmatrix} -\cos\beta \\ \sin\beta \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^2$ there exists $\phi_0$ and $\phi_N$ in $D(\mathcal{R})$ such that $\phi_0(0+) = c$ and $\phi_N(N-) = w$ and the support of $\phi_0$ and $\phi_N$ are contained in $[0, N]$. Clearly $\phi_0$ , $\phi_N$ are linearly independent but $\phi_0$ , $\phi_N$ are not in $D(\mathcal{R}_0)$. This shows that $D(\mathcal{R}_0) \subset D(R_0) + L(\phi_0, \phi_N) \subset D(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta})$. Because of the boundary condition at 0 and $N$, $D(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta})$ is 2-dimensional restriction of $D(\mathcal{R})$. Hence $D(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}) = D(\mathcal{R}_0) + L(\phi_0, \phi_N)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is 2-dimensional extension of $\mathcal{R}_0$ so that $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is a self-adjoint relation. $\square$

Let $u(x, z)$ and $v(x, z)$ be the solution of the canonical system 1.1 on $[0, N]$ with the initial values

$$u(0, z) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, v(0, z) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For $z \in C^+$ there is a unique $m(z)$ such that $f(x, z) = u(x, z) + m(z)v(x, z)$ satisfying

$$f_1(N, z)\sin\beta + f_2(N, z)\cos\beta = 0.$$

This is well defined because $u$ does not satisfy the boundary condition at $N$ otherwise $z$ will be an eigenvalue of some self-adjoint relation $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$. The coefficients $m(z)$ are called Weyl m-functions and are well explained in [6].

Next, we describe the spectrum of $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$. Let

$$T(x, z) = \begin{pmatrix} u_1(x, z) & v_1(x, z) \\ u_2(x, z) & v_2(x, z) \end{pmatrix}, \quad T(0, z) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and define

$$w_\alpha(x, z) = \frac{1}{\sin\alpha + m(z)\cos\alpha} T(x, z) \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha \\ -\sin\alpha \end{pmatrix}$$

We have the following lemma

**Lemma 3.11.** *Using the notation above we have*

$$f(x,z)w_\alpha(x,\bar{z})^* - w_\alpha(x,z)f(x,\bar{z})^* = T(x,z)JT(x,\bar{z})^* = J.$$

*Proof.* Here,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x,z)w_\alpha(x,\bar{z})^* &= T(x,z)\begin{pmatrix}1\\ m(z)\end{pmatrix}(\cos\alpha, -\sin\alpha)\frac{1}{\sin\alpha + m(z)\cos\alpha}T(x,\bar{z})^*\\
&= \frac{1}{\sin\alpha+m(z)\cos\alpha}T(x,z)\begin{pmatrix}\cos\alpha & -\sin\alpha\\ m(z)\cos\alpha & -m(z)\sin\alpha\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}0 & 1\\ -1 & 0\end{pmatrix}JT(x,\bar{z})^*\\
&= \frac{1}{\sin\alpha+m(z)\cos\alpha}T(x,z)\begin{pmatrix}\sin\alpha & \cos\alpha\\ m(z)\sin\alpha & m(z)\cos\alpha\end{pmatrix}JT(x,\bar{z})^*.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
w_\alpha(x,z)f(x,\bar{z})^* &= \frac{1}{\sin\alpha+m(z)\cos\alpha}T(x,z)\begin{pmatrix}\cos\alpha\\ -\sin\alpha\end{pmatrix}(1, m(z))T(x,\bar{z})^*\\
&= \frac{1}{\sin\alpha+m(z)\cos\alpha}T(x,z)\begin{pmatrix}\cos\alpha\\ -\sin\alpha\end{pmatrix}(1, m(z))\begin{pmatrix}0 & 1\\ -1 & 0\end{pmatrix}JT(x,\bar{z})^*\\
&= \frac{1}{\sin\alpha+m(z)\cos\alpha}T(x,z)\begin{pmatrix}\cos\alpha & m(z)\cos\alpha\\ -\sin\alpha & -m(z)\cos\alpha\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}0 & 1\\ -1 & 0\end{pmatrix}JT(x,\bar{z})^*\\
&= \frac{1}{\sin\alpha+m(z)\cos\alpha}T(x,z)\begin{pmatrix}-m(z)\cos\alpha & \cos\alpha\\ m(z)\sin\alpha & -\sin\alpha\end{pmatrix}JT(x,\bar{z})^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&f(x,z)w_\alpha(x,\bar{z})^* - w_\alpha(x,z)f(x,\bar{z})^*\\
&\quad= \frac{1}{\sin\alpha+m(z)\cos\alpha}T(x,z)\begin{pmatrix}\sin\alpha+m(z)\cos\alpha & 0\\ 0 & \sin\alpha+m(z)\cos\alpha\end{pmatrix}JT(x,\bar{z})^*.\\
&\quad= T(x,z)JT(x,\bar{z})^*\\
&\quad= J.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 3.12.** *Let* $z \in \Gamma(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta})$ *then* $(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}$ *is a bounded linear operator and is defined by*

$$(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}h(x) = \int_0^N G(x,t,z)H(t)h(t)dt,$$

*where* $G(x,t,z) = \begin{cases} f(x,z)w_\alpha(t,\bar{z_0})^* & \text{if } 0 < t \le x\\ w_\alpha(t,\bar{z})f(x,\bar{z_0}) & \text{if } x < t \le N.\end{cases}$

*Proof.* Let $y(x,z) = \int_0^N G(x,t,z)H(t)h(t)dt$. We show that $y(x,z)$ solves the inhomogeneous equation

$$Jy' = zHy - Hh$$

for $a.e. x > 0$. Here

$$y(x,z) = \int_0^x f(x,z)w_\alpha(t,\bar{z})^*H(t)h(t)dt + \int_x^N w_\alpha(x,z)f(t,\bar{z})^*H(t)h(t)dt$$

and $Jf' = zHf, Jw'_\alpha = zHw_\alpha$. Then on differentiation we get,

$$\begin{aligned} y'(x,z) &= f(x,z)w_\alpha(x,\bar{z})^*H(x)h(x) + f'(x,z)\int_0^x w_\alpha(t,\bar{z})^*H(t)h(t)dt \\ &\quad -w_\alpha(x,z)f(x,\bar{z})^*H(x)h(x) + w'_\alpha(x,z)\int_x^N f(t,\bar{z})^*H(t)h(t)dt. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} Jy'(x,z) &= Jf(x,z)w_\alpha(x,\bar{z})^*H(x)h(x) + Jf'(x,z)\int_0^x w_\alpha(t,\bar{z})^*H(t)h(t)dt \\ &\quad -Jw_\alpha(x,z)f(x,\bar{z})^*H(x)h(x) + Jw'_\alpha(x,z)\int_x^N f(t,\bar{z})^*H(t)h(t)dt \\ &= Jf(x,z)w_\alpha(x,\bar{z})^*H(x)h(x) + zHf(x,z)\int_0^x w_\alpha(t,\bar{z})^*H(t)h(t)dt \\ &\quad -Jw_\alpha(x,z)f(x,\bar{z})^*H(x)h(x) + zHw_\alpha(x,z)\int_x^N f(t,\bar{z})^*H(t)h(t)dt. \\ &= J\Big(f(x,z)w_\alpha(x,\bar{z})^* - w_\alpha(x,z)f(x,\bar{z})^*\Big)Hh+ \\ &\quad zH\Big(\int_0^x f(x,z)w_\alpha(t,\bar{z})^*H(t)h(t)dt + \int_x^N w_\alpha(x,z)f(t,\bar{z})^*H(t)h(t)dt\Big) \\ &= JJHh + zHy \\ &= zHy - Hh. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand denote $g(x,z)$ as

$$g(x,z) = (\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}h(x)$$

then by Theorem 2.11, $h(x) = zu - v$ for some $(u,v) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ so that $(g, zg - h) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$. So $g(x,z)$ also satisfies the inhomogeneous problem and $g(x,z) \in D(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta})$, it satisfies the boundary condition which implies that $g(0,z) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha \\ -\sin\alpha \end{pmatrix} c(z)$ for some scalar $c(z)$. We have

$$y(0,z) = \frac{1}{\sin\alpha + m(z)\cos\alpha}\begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha \\ -\sin\alpha \end{pmatrix}\langle f(x,\bar{z}), h\rangle$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f(.,\bar{z}), h\rangle &= \langle f(.,\bar{z}), h\rangle - \langle f(.,\bar{z}), zg\rangle + \langle f(.,\bar{z}), zg\rangle \\ &= \langle f(.,\bar{z}), h - zg\rangle + z\langle f(.,\bar{z}), g\rangle \\ &= -\int_0^N f(x,\bar{z})^*H(zg-h)dx + z\int_0^N f(x,\bar{z})^*Hgdx \\ &= -\int_0^N f(x,\bar{z})^*Jg'dx - \int_0^N f'(x,\bar{z})^*Jgdx \\ &= f(0,\bar{z})^*Jg(0,z) - f(N,\bar{z})^*Jg(N,z). \end{aligned}$$

Since both $f(x,z)$ and $g(x,z)$ satisfies the same boundary condition at $N$ $f(N,\bar{z})^*Jg(N,z) = 0$. Now

$$f(0,\bar{z})^*Jg(0,z) = (1, m(z))\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha \\ -\sin\alpha \end{pmatrix}c(z).$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}y(0,z) &= \frac{1}{\sin\alpha + m(z)\cos\alpha}\begin{pmatrix}\cos\alpha\\ -\sin\alpha\end{pmatrix}(1, m(z))\begin{pmatrix}0 & -1\\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\cos\alpha\\ -\sin\alpha\end{pmatrix}c(z)\\ &= \frac{1}{\sin\alpha + m(z)\cos\alpha}\begin{pmatrix}\cos\alpha\\ -\sin\alpha\end{pmatrix}(m(z), -1)\begin{pmatrix}\cos\alpha\\ -\sin\alpha\end{pmatrix}c(z)\\ &= \begin{pmatrix}\cos\alpha\\ -\sin\alpha\end{pmatrix}c(z)\\ &= g(0,z).\end{aligned}$$

By uniqueness we must have , $g(x,z) = y(x,z)$. We have already shown in Theorem that 2.2 $(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}$ is a bounded linear operator.

□

Now define a map $V : L^2(H,[0,N]) \to L^2(I,[0,N])$ by

$$Vy = H^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)y(x).$$

Here $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)$ is the unique positive semi-definite square root of $H(x)$. Then $V$ is an isometry and hence maps $L^2(H,[0,N])$ unitarily onto the range $R(V) \subset L^2(I,[0,N])$. Define an integral operator $\mathcal{L}$ on $L^2(I,[0,N])$ as

$$(\mathcal{L}f)(x) = \int_0^N L(x,t)f(t)dt, \quad L(x,t) = H^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)G(x,t)H^{\frac{1}{2}}(t).$$

The kernel $L$ is square integrable since

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^N\int_0^N \|L^*L\|dxdt &\le \int_0^N\int_0^N \|VG^*\|\|(VG)^*\|dxdt\\ &\le \int_0^N\int_0^N \|G^*\|\|G\|dxdt < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

So $\mathcal{L}$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator and thus compact. Since $L(x,t) = L^*(t,x), \mathcal{L}$ is also self-adjoint.

**Lemma 3.13.** [5] *Let $f \in L^2(I,[0,N]), \lambda \neq 0$, then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. $\mathcal{L}f = \lambda^{-1}f$.
2. $f \in R(V)$, *and the unique* $y \in L^2(H,[0,N])$ *with* $Vy = f$ *solves* $(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}y = \lambda y$.

*Proof.* For all $g \in L^2(I,[0,N])$ we have,

$$(\mathcal{L}g)(x) = H^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)w(x) \text{ where } w(x) = \int_0^N G(x,t)H^{\frac{1}{2}}(t)g(t)dt,$$

lies in $L^2(H,[0,N])$. Then $R(\mathcal{L}) \subset R(V)$. Now if (1) holds then $f = \lambda\mathcal{L}f \in R(V)$. So $f = V(y)$ for unique $y \in L^2(H,[0,N])$ and

$$f(x) = H^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)y(x) = \lambda\mathcal{L}y(x) = \lambda H^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)\int_0^N G(x,t)H(t)y(t)dt$$

for $a.e. x \in [0,N]$. In other words,

$$H^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)\big(y(x) - \lambda\int_0^N G(x,t)H(t)y(t)dt\big) = 0.$$

Conversely if (2) holds,

$$\lambda y = \int_0^N G(x,t)H(t)y(t)dt$$

then $H^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)y = \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_0^N H^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)G(x,t)H(t)y(t)dt$.

□

**Lemma 3.14.** *Let $z \in \mathbb{C}$. For any $\lambda \neq z$, if $(f, \lambda f) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ then $f$ solves $(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}y = \frac{1}{\lambda - z}y$. Conversely, if $y \in L^2(H,[0,N])$ and $y$ solves $(T^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}y = \lambda y$ then $(y, (z + \frac{1}{\lambda})y) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$.*

*Proof.* Let $(f, \lambda f) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ then $(f, \lambda f - zf) \in (\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)$. It follows that

$$((\lambda - z)f, f) \in (\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1} \Rightarrow \Big(f, \frac{1}{(\lambda - z)}\Big) \in (\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}.$$

This means that $f$ solves

$$(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}y = \frac{1}{\lambda - z}y.$$

Conversely suppose $y \in L^2(H,[0,N])$ and $y$ solves

$$(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}y = \lambda y.$$

That is $(y, \lambda y) \in (\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}$ so that $(\lambda y, y) \in (\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)$. So there is $(f,g) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ such that $\lambda y = f$ and

$$g - zf = y \Rightarrow g = y + z\lambda y.$$

Hence

$$(\lambda y, y + z\lambda y) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} \Rightarrow \Big(y, (z + \frac{1}{\lambda}y)\Big) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}.$$

□

By Lemma 3.13 we see that there is a one to one correspondence of eigenvalues (eigenfunctions) for the operator $\mathcal{L}$ and $(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}$. As $\mathcal{L}$ is compact operator, it has only discrete spectrum consisting of only eigenvalues. Since $(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}$ is unitarily equivalent with $\mathcal{L} \restriction_{R(V)}$, that is

$$V^{-1}\mathcal{L} \restriction_{R(V)} V = (\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1},$$

$(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta} - z)^{-1}$ has only discrete spectrum consisting of only eigenvalues. Then by Theorem 2.17, $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ has only discrete spectrum. By Lemma3.14, the spectrum of $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}$ consists only eigenvalues. Hence we have

$$\sigma(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,\beta}) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : u_{\alpha 1}(N,z)\sin\beta + u_{\alpha 2}\cos\beta = 0\}.$$

We would like to extend this idea over the half line $\mathbb{R}_+$. First note that we are considering the limit circle case of the system 1.1. That implies for any $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ the deficiency indices of $\mathcal{R}_0$ are $(2,2)$. Suppose $p \in D(\mathcal{R}) \setminus D(\mathcal{R}_0)$ such that $\lim\limits_{x\to\infty} p(x)^*Jp(x) = 0$. Such function clearly exists.

Consider the relation

$$\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p} = \{(f,g) \in \mathcal{R} : f_1(0)\sin\alpha + f_2(0,z)\cos\alpha = 0 \\ \text{and } \lim_{x\to\infty} f(x)^*Jp(x) = 0\}.$$

**Lemma 3.15.** *$\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}$ defines a self-adjoint extension of $\mathcal{R}_0$.*

*Proof.* Let $u(x)$ be a solution of the system 1.1 with some initial values and $p(x)$ as above. Define $u_0(x) = 0$ near the neighborhood of $\infty$ ie $\lim_{x\to\infty} u_0(x) = 0$ and $u_0(x) = u(x)$ otherwise. Similarly, $p_0(x) = 0$ in the neighborhood of 0 and $p_0(x) = p(x)$ otherwise. Then clearly $u_0, p_0 \notin D(\mathcal{R}_0)$ and are linearly independent. Clearly $D(\mathcal{R}_0) + L(u_0, p_0) \subset D(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p})$. Since $D(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p})$ is at least 2-dimensional restriction of $D(\mathcal{R})$,

$$D(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}) = D(\mathcal{R}_0) + L(u_0, p_0).$$

Hence $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}$ is a self-adjoint relation. □

We next discuss the spectrum of $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}$. Let $u(x,z)$ and $v(x,z)$ be two linearly independent solutions of the system 1.1 with

$$u(0,z) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, v(0,z) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$ and as above write $f(x,z) = u(x,z) + m(z)v(x,z) \in L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ satisfying $\lim_{x\to\infty} f(x,z)^* JP(x) = 0$. Let $T(x,z) = \begin{pmatrix} u_1 & v_1 \\ u_2 & v_2 \end{pmatrix}$ and

$$w_\alpha(x,z) = \frac{1}{\sin\alpha + m(z)\cos\alpha} T(x,z) \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha \\ -\sin\alpha \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then as in Lemma 3.11 we have,

$$f(x,z)w_\alpha(x,\bar{z})^* - w_\alpha(x,z)f(x,\bar{z})^* = T(x,z)JT(x,\bar{z})^* = J.$$

**Lemma 3.16.** *Let $z \in \rho(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p})$ then the resolvent operator $(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p} - z)^{-1}$ is given by*

$$(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p} - z)^{-1} h(x) = \int_0^\infty G(x,t,z)H(t)h(t)dt$$

*where* $G(x,t,z) = \begin{cases} f(x,z)w_\alpha(t,\bar{z})^* & \text{if } 0 < t \le x \\ w_\alpha(t,\bar{z})f(x,\bar{z}) & \text{if } x < t \le \infty \end{cases}$

*Proof.* Let $y(x,z) = \int_0^\infty G(x,t,z)H(t)h(t)dt$ then $y$ solves the inhomogeneous equation

$$Jy' = zHy - Hh.$$

This clear by differentiating

$$y(x,z) = \int_0^x f(x,z)w_\alpha(t,\bar{z})^* H(t)h(t)dt + \int_x^\infty w_\alpha(x,z)f(t,\bar{z})^* H(t)h(t)dt.$$

On the other hand denote $g(x,z)$ as $g(x,z) = (\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p} - z)^{-1}h(x)$ then by Theorem 2.11, $h(x) = zu - v$ for some $(u,v) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}$ so that $(g, zg - h) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}$ and hence $g$ satisfies the inhomogeneous equation. Since $g \in D(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p})$

$$g_1(0,z)\sin\alpha + g_2(0,z)\cos\alpha = 0, \lim_{x\to\infty} g^*(x,z)Jp(x,z) = 0.$$

We also have $\lim_{x\to\infty} f^*(x,z)Jg(x,z) = 0$ and $g(0,z) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha \\ -\sin\alpha \end{pmatrix} c(z)$ for some scalar $c(z)$. But also we have

$$y(0,z) = \frac{1}{(m(z)\cos\alpha + \sin\alpha)} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha \\ \sin\alpha \end{pmatrix} \langle f(\bar{z}), h\rangle.$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f(\bar z), h\rangle &= \langle f(\bar z), h\rangle - \langle f(\bar z), zg\rangle - \langle \bar z f(\bar z), g\rangle \\ &= \langle f(\bar z), h + zg\rangle - \langle \bar z f(\bar z), g\rangle \\ &= f^*(0, \bar z)Jg(0, z) - \lim_{x\to\infty} f^*(x, z)Jg(x, z) \\ &= f^*(0, \bar z)Jg(0, z).\end{aligned}$$

Hence $y(0, z) = g(0, z)$. By uniqueness we have $y(x, z) = g(x, z)$. □

Now define a map $V : L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+) \to L^2(I, \mathbb{R}_+)$ by $Vy = H^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)y(x)$. $V$ is isometry and maps unitarily onto the range $R(V) \subset L^2(I, \mathbb{R}_+)$.

Define an integral operator $\mathcal{L}$ on $L^2(I, \mathbb{R}_+)$ by

$$(\mathcal{L}g)(x) = \int_0^\infty L(x, t)g(t)dt, \ \ L(x, t) = H^{\frac{1}{2}}(x)G(x, t, z)H^{\frac{1}{2}}(t).$$

Then as before the kernel $L$ is square integrable. This means that

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \parallel L^*L \parallel < \infty.$$

Hence $\mathcal{L}$ is a Hilbert Schmidt a operator and so is a compact operator. The following two lemmas are extended from the bounded interval $[0, N]$ to $\mathbb{R}_+$ and the proofs are exactly the same as the proofs of Lemma 3.13 and Lemma 3.14.

**Lemma 3.17.** [5] *Let* $f \in L^2(I, R_+), \lambda \neq 0$, *then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) $\mathcal{L}f = \lambda^{-1}f$.
(2) $f \in R(V)$, *and the unique* $y \in L^2(H, R_+)$ *with* $Vy = f$ *solves* $(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p} - z)^{-1}y = \lambda y$.

**Lemma 3.18.** *Let* $z \in \mathbb{C}$. *For any* $\lambda \neq z$, *if* $(y, \lambda y) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}$ *then* $y$ *solves* $(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p} - z)^{-1}y = \frac{1}{\lambda - z}y$. *Conversely, if* $y \in L^2(H, R_+)$ *and* $y$ *solves* $(T^{\alpha,p} - z)^{-1}y = \lambda y$ *then* $(y, (z + \frac{1}{\lambda})y) \in \mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}$.

Again by Lemma 3.17, we have a one to one correspondence of eigenvalues (eigenfunctions) for the operator $\mathcal{L}$ and $(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p} - z)^{-1}$. As $\mathcal{L}$ is compact operator, it has only discrete spectrum consisting of only eigenvalues and possibly zero. Since $(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p} - z)^{-1}$ is unitarily equivalent with $\mathcal{L} \downharpoonright_{R(V)}$, that is $V^{-1}\mathcal{L} \downharpoonright_{R(V)} V = (\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p} - z)^{-1}, (\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p} - z)^{-1}$ has only discrete spectrum consisting of only eigenvalues. Then by Theorem 2.17, $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}$ has only discrete spectrum. By Lemma 3.18 the spectrum of $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}$ consists of only eigenvalues.

**Theorem 3.19.** *In the limit circle case, the defect index* $\beta(\mathcal{R}_0, z)$ *of* $\mathcal{R}_0$ *is constant on* $\mathbb{C}$.

*Proof.* Since $\mathcal{R}_0$ is a symmetric relation, by Theorem 2.3 the defect index $\beta(\mathcal{R}_0, z)$ is constant on upper and lower half planes and by Lemma 3.8 $\beta(\mathcal{R}_0, z) = 2$. Suppose $\beta(\mathcal{R}_0, \lambda) < 2$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\Gamma(\mathcal{R}_0)$ is open, $\lambda \notin \Gamma(\mathcal{R}_0)$ and hence $\lambda \in S(\mathcal{R}_0)$. Since for each $\alpha \in (0, \pi]$, $\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}$ is self-adjoint extension of $\mathcal{R}_0$, $\lambda \in S(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p}) = \sigma(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p})$. Since $\sigma(\mathcal{T}^{\alpha,p})$ consists of only eigenvalues, $\lambda$ is an eigenvalue for all boundary conditions $\alpha$ at 0. However, this is impossible unless $\beta(\mathcal{R}_0, \lambda) = 2$. □

In the following theorem we will show the neat application of the above theorem.

**Theorem 3.20.** *Consider the canonical system 1.1 with trace$H \equiv 1$ then it prevails limit point case.*

*Proof.* Suppose it prevails the limit circle case. That means all solutions of 1.1 are in $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$. By Theorem 3.19, for $0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\dim N(\mathcal{R}, 0) = 2$. In particular, 0 is an eigenvalue and $u(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $v(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ are the eigenfunctions of the relation $\mathcal{R}$ in $L^2(H, \mathbb{R}_+)$ . However, $\int_0^\infty u(x)^* H(x) u(x) dx + \int_0^\infty v(x)^* H(x) v(x) dx = \int_0^\infty \text{trace} H(x) dx = \infty$. This is a contradiction. It follows that the canonical system 1.1 has limit point case. □

## References

[1] L de Branges. Some Hilber Space of entire functions II. *Tran. Americal Mathematical Soeiety*, 99: 118-152, 1961.

[2] I.S. Kac. On the Hilbert spaces, generated by monotone Hermitian matrix functions. *Kharkov, Zap Mat. o-va*, 22: 95–113, 1950.

[3] Seppo Hassi, Henk De Snoo, and Henrik Winkler. Boundary-value problems for two-dimensional canonical systems. *Integral Equations Operator Theory.*, 36(4): 445–479, 2000.

[4] Joachim Weidmann. Linear Operators in Hilbert Spaces. *Springer-Verlag*, 1980.

[5] Remling, Christian. Schrödinger operators and de Branges spaces. *Journal of Functional Analysis.* 196(2): 323–394 , 2002.

[6] Keshav Acharya. Remling's Theorem on Canonical System (In preparation ).

[7] Henrik Winkler. The inverse spectral problem for canonical systems. *Integral Equations Operator Theory.*, 22: 360–374, 1995.

[8] E. A. Coddington, N. Levinson. Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations. *J. McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc.*, 1995.

[9] S. Hassi, C. Remling, and H.S.V. de Snoo. Subordinate solutions and spectral measures of canonical systems. *Integral Equation and Operator Theory*, 37: 48 - 63, 2000.

[10] A.Dijksma, H.S.V. De Snoo. Self-Adjoint Extension of Symmetric Subspaces. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 54(1),1974.

[11] E.A. Coddington. Extension theory of formallly normal and symmetric subspaces. *Mem.Amer.Math.Soc.* 134, 1973.